

with the St. John District Association of California, Nevada, and parts of Africa. In March 2000, Christian Community Church purchased the building at 3838 N. West Avenue.

In 2005, Pastor Jackson united the church with the First Northern Central District Association of California, Nevada, and parts of Africa. Pastor Jackson served as Bible teacher, Vice-Executive Director, Member of the Board of Christian Education, Vice Moderator, and as Moderator of the First Northern Central District Association for over 5 years. With strong leadership, the last 22 years have been tremendously transformative for Christian Community Baptist Church. As they continue to grow and prosper, their effects in the community have helped too.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Christian Community Baptist Church as it celebrates its 22nd Anniversary. I commend Christian Community Baptist Church for its 22 years of commitment to service and I wish Dr. Jackson and the church many more years of service.

POSITION ON THE METHANE RULE

HON. GARRET GRAVES

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 2021

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I was unable to take part in debating and voting on the revocation of the previous administration's rule governing methane emissions due to meetings with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to address long-overlooked issues impacting South Louisiana's veterans. The Baton Rouge VA outpatient clinic in my district is undersized and not well suited to the needs of the Capital Region's veterans. Multiple administrations have highlighted the need to authorize a new lease—but it hasn't happened and getting veterans timely access to quality health care remains a top priority for me.

Had I been in Washington, D.C., I would have voted against S.J. Res 14 to repeal the "Oil and Natural Gas Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Review." We cannot afford to move backwards on President Trump's policies that put American energy first.

I support efforts to reduce methane emissions. I support smart regulations that result in reducing methane emissions. But I do not support an approach that results in stifling innovation and creates barriers to cost-effectively reducing methane emissions.

The United States has led the world in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and investing in innovation that will ensure continued reductions in emissions here and around the world. We produce resources and goods with a carbon profile envied around the world—that includes oil and gas. As global demand increases, as it is projected to do for natural gas, America should be supplying that demand. Especially if you care about global emissions and climate change.

With the deployment of innovative technologies, the use of our resources will become even cleaner. That's why we need a regime that encourages innovation and incentivizes the development and deployment of technologies to mitigate and monitor methane

emissions. Putting up barriers or making U.S. production of resources more expensive will drive up global emissions because it gives the competitive advantage in the global market to higher emitting resources—like those coming from Russia and China.

This CRA is not about reducing methane emissions, it's not about climate change, and it isn't about national security. It is solely about reducing energy choices. Moreover, this is about regulating an entire sector of the U.S. economy out of business. The majority is not shy about stating their goal—whether through an outright ban or death by a thousand cuts. And what is most insidious is that the anti-American oil and gas agenda doesn't apply to fossil energy outside the United States.

In fact, their actions benefit and subsidize fossil energy in other countries. You don't have to believe me, just look at their actions: we've seen cheers when the administration stops the construction of pipelines at home, actions which cost thousands of jobs for American families, reduce our energy security, and ultimately result in higher global emissions. Democrats sat on their hands as President Biden green-lit the Nord Stream 2 pipeline to carry natural gas from Russia to our allies in Europe—resulting in a stronger Putin and higher global emissions than if the United States had supplied that energy.

The majority voted against an amendment condemning the Russia action and Russian pipeline. Emissions never factored into their vote. In fact, Russian natural gas exported to Europe has a lifecycle greenhouse gas emission profile at least 42 percent higher than U.S. liquefied natural gas exported to Europe from Louisiana. Their singular intent was to reduce demand for an American resource by increasing the supply of Russian natural gas to our allies.

At home, their opposition to pipelines has resulted in increased use of higher-emitting heating oil and the importing of significantly higher-emitting natural gas from Russia. And while opposing lower emission production in America, progressives have called for increased oil production in Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and Russia.

Don't believe me? Let me read a quote from a letter signed by several members of the current majority to President Trump in 2018: "Today we call on you to use all of your authority to . . . pressure the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and cooperating countries to Increase World Oil Supplies." That letter was signed by, among others, the current Leader of the Senate, CHUCK SCHUMER, and the author of the Green New Deal, ED MARKEY—the same crowd who advocated for banning American production of oil, American pipelines, and regulating out of existence any remaining American oil and gas. If this were about emissions, they wouldn't be advocating for increased production from higher polluting countries while reducing production from the more carbon efficient United States.

Members of the majority have repeatedly voted against amendment after amendment that would have halted action if the action would result in increased global emissions. Let me say that again, they voted against lower emissions. I know because they were my amendments. It doesn't end there: in the infrastructure bill which we are set to consider next week, there is a designation of "high per-

forming" states based on climate policies. We offered an amendment during committee markup that would remove that designation if those same policies resulted in a disproportionate negative impact on disadvantaged communities. This amendment was voted down. Under the current text of the Invest Act, states that are being sued by civil rights groups for climate policies that hurt disadvantaged communities will be rewarded.

They have voted against amendments that would have clamped down on child labor in Africa and slave labor in China, because it's inconsistent with the progressive anti-U.S. energy agenda. For every ton of emissions reduced by the United States, China has increased its emissions by 4 tons—and yet, policies coming from the other side will export jobs to China, increase global emissions, and increase American dependence on China.

Again, don't believe me? Let me read from a report put out by the Senate Democrats' Climate Committee: "As we institute domestic decarbonization policies that increase overall production costs . . . we could see U.S. companies shift their production to countries that are less restrictive on carbon emissions . . . This will not only lead to an increase in total global emissions, but also the outsourcing of American jobs." And they haven't included a single policy in any of their climate bills to counteract this result of outsourcing American jobs and increasing global emissions. Is it any wonder why we question their motives for this action today?

There is a way to effectively address methane emissions without costing jobs and increasing global emissions. I am on board with that discussion. But it isn't about that. It's about one more of the thousand cuts to destroy American jobs, reduce American competitiveness, and increase global emissions.

IN RECOGNITION OF LORETTA CANNON'S OVER 40 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE DOWNRIVER COMMUNITY CONFERENCE

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 28, 2021

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Loretta Cannon on the occasion of her retirement after nearly 43 years of service to the Downriver Community Conference. Her significant contributions to the Downriver community are worthy of commendation.

Ms. Cannon began working for the Downriver Community Conference in 1980, as a Switchboard Operator at the Superior Street site in Wyandotte, where she worked directly with the Conference's Employment & Training Program. Since then, she has remained a valuable employee of the Conference, serving as Administrative Assistant in the Economic Development and Brownfield Development Programs, with her latest role in the Workforce Program. A true testament to her perseverance, she earned her bachelor's degree while working full time at the Conference.

Known to coworkers and friends as someone with a warm heart and generous spirit, Ms. Cannon has always been there to help friends, family, colleagues, and even complete